

REMARKS

The application contains 34 claims (76-78, 114-117, 136-155 and 158-164), where claim 136 is independent.

Previously cancelled independent claims 1, 26, 29, 32, 43, 44, 49, 54, 62, 70, 75, 79, 85, 87, 91 and 101 are herein re-introduced.

Except for some remarks regarding some of the dependent claims, the following arguments relate to the independent claims. The dependent claims are patentable for at least the same reasons as the independent claim from which they depend.

Claims 76-78, 114-117, 136-155 and 158-164 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Martin et al. (US 6,035,334).

Independent claim 136

Claim 136 recites "...providing to the site, a user profile record of the user transmitting the request, by a second entity not associated with the first entity...".

Claim 136 is herein amended to include a limitation of a "predefined site-independent" user profile record, namely:

"...providing to the site, a **predefined site-independent** user profile record of the user transmitting the request, by a second entity not associated with the first entity..." [emphasis added]

The amendment is supported in the specifications, for example in page 7 lines 21-23: "*In a preferred embodiment of the invention, a plurality of personalities are predefined. Modifying a persona and/or a mood may include switching between such predefined personalities*". Another example of the specifications is in page 20 lines 20-28: "*The above described information about a persona may be stored in one or more of many ways, in accordance with preferred embodiments of the invention. In a preferred embodiment of the invention, the information is implicit in a program and/or a set of programs of scripts which carry-out the persona. Additionally or alternatively, the information is stored as parameters for predefined and/or user defined functions. Additionally or alternatively, parameter values comprise scripts or functions which generate values, responsive to input values, internal variables, global*

variables, other parameters of the persona and/or the parameters of the mood. Additionally or alternatively, the information is stored as values for preset persona parameters".

Applicants submit that the added limitation of predefined site-independent profile distinguishes between claim 136 and Martin, since Martin teaches that the user establishes a 'user state' that depends on previous interactions with a site. For example, in Col. 4 lines 34-40 Martin discloses: *"while connected to site A, the user interacts with site A and thereby establishes "state". As used herein, the term "state" is intended to mean information such as the user's identity, the user's password, and other information relating to the user's interaction with base site A."* [emphasis added]

Dependent claim 144

Applicant respectfully submits that there is no *prima facie* case for anticipation of claim 144 in view of Martin because a limitation of the claim is not met by Martin as discussed below.

Claim 144 recites: "... providing the information content of the Internet page without relation to the user profile of the user transmitting the request".

Applicant submits that Martin does not teach providing the information content of the Internet page without relation to the user profile of the user transmitting the request. On the contrary, Martin discloses providing content responsive to the user 'state' (i.e. profile). For example, in Col. 3 lines 30-33 Martin discloses: *"This enhanced state information may then be utilized by the next Web site which is accessed so as to format, configure and/or supplement the information displayed to the user at the new site being accessed".*

Therefore, since a limitation of providing information irrespective of the profile is lacking in Martin, Applicants submit that claim 144 is patentable over Martin.

Dependent claim 155

Applicant respectfully submits that there is no *prima facie* case for anticipation of claim 155 in view of Martin because a limitation of the claim is not met by Martin as discussed below.

Claim 155 recites": ...selecting the display format at least partially by a persona server, separate from the site, which provides the presentations to the users".

Applicants submit that Martin does not teach a separate server for 'state' (i.e. persona) but, rather, the state is incrementally updated by visiting **related sites**. For example, in Col. 2 lines 47-50 Martin discloses "*each successively visited Web site is provided with user-specific information regarding that user's prior interaction with others of the related Web sites*".

Therefore, since a limitation of a separate persona server is lacking in Martin, Applicants submit that claim 155 is patentable over Martin.

Dependent claim 158

Applicant respectfully submits that there is no *prima facie* case for anticipation of claim 158 in view of Martin because a limitation of the claim is not met by Martin as discussed below.

Claim 158 recites: "A method according to claim 136, comprising repeating (a), (b), (c) and (d) for a plurality of unrelated sites using a single user profile".

Applicants submit that Martin does not teach using a **single** user profile in **unrelated** sites, but, on the contrary, Martin teaches visiting **related** sites only wherein the 'state' (i.e. profile) is **varied** and **responsive** to the related sites. For example, in Col. 2 lines 47-50 Martin discloses "*each successively visited Web site is provided with user-specific information regarding that user's prior interaction with others of the related Web sites*".

Therefore, since a limitation of using a single profile for a plurality of unrelated sites is lacking in Martin, Applicants submit that claim 158 is patentable over Martin.

Dependent claim 160

Applicant respectfully submits that there is no *prima facie* case for anticipation of claim 160 in view of Martin because a limitation of the claim is not met by Martin as discussed below.

Claim 160 recites"... providing the user profile record of a user comprises providing a record at least partially determined for one or more other users".

Applicants submit that Martin does not disclose a state (i.e. profile) that is determined for other users. On the contrary, Martin teaches a 'state' that is **unique** to a

person due to the interaction of that person with related sites. For example, in Col. 4 lines 34-40 Martin discloses: *"while connected to site A, the user interacts with site A and thereby establishes "state". As used herein, the term "state" is intended to mean information such as the user's identity, the user's password, and other information relating to the user's interaction with base site A."*

Therefore, since a limitation of a record determined for other users is lacking in Martin, Applicants submit that claim 160 is patentable over Martin.

Restoring original claims

In a response to Office Action dated July 8, 2004, Applicants noted that "Many of the claims of the application were cancelled in order to focus the prosecution of the present application on a limited number of issues."

Original independent claims 1, 26, 29, 32, 43, 44, 49, 54, 62, 70, 75, 79, 85, 87, 91 and 101 which were cancelled are hereby re-introduced since the new (suspended) rules as of November 1, 2007, restrict the filing of voluntary divisional applications.

In view of the above remarks, Applicants submit that the dependent claims are allowable at least because they depend on an allowable claim. Applicants submit that the application is now in order for allowance. Notice to that effect is respectfully solicited.

If, however, the Examiner is of the opinion that not all claims are in condition for allowance and feels that a telephone conversation may forward the present application toward allowance, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner call the undersigned's US representative.

Respectfully submitted,

Martin D. Moynihan

Martin D. Moynihan
Registration No. 40,338

November 26, 2007